

82-17

19 July 1948

• SUGGESTIONS OF STAFF INTELLIGENCE GROUP

1. pp. 1-4. This historical survey leaves one basking in the bucolic solitude of 1889 wondering if anything happened in the next 69 years. Leaping from 1889 to the governmental section, one suddenly comes face to face with a succession of dictators who flourished at some period unspecified. Needs a word on 1889-1948.
2. This whole business—at least from p.9-p.17 will have to be rewritten. The material certainly isn't intrinsically interesting, but no explanation of it has to be as painfully dull as this. Instead of plodding along through the various powers granted in the Brazilian constitution, why not use some sort of analytical approach? From this neutral corner, it would look as if the various features described arose naturally from various sad experiences Brazil has had with dictators. What they seem to have done, each time a new dictator found a way to abrogate the constitution by chicanery, was to add another law designed to stop such malpractices in the future. Why not indicate the salient points in the Brazilian code from this approach for instance?
3. Please also try rewrite of sections marked by green line in margin. If you want an example of why some sort of rewriting is necessary and why it ought to be done in the Branch, look at p.23, para.1. So far as I'm concerned, all it says is said in what we have left of it, but from ignorance of Brazil, we may have misstated the matter grossly. The Branch could do this sort of cutting more intelligently.

000065

4. pp.31 ff. Too detailed and too dull. It is enough, for example, to perceive on p.31, line 9 that PSD is deeply committed to maintenance of the status quo and then to sustain the rude shock at line 17, of discovering that party is anti-Communist.

If the Branch would agree, believe it would be definitely worth while to cover the parties by a brief analysis of each and then to relegate the details here outlined to a Table. You might have to get along without all the planks in each platform, but it hardly seems relevant to list each.

There's more history of the Communist party than there is of Brazil!

5. pp.49-58. This is a question rather than a suggestion, but the discussion appears off hand to be rather over-elaborate, especially in a matter dealing primarily with local issues of a current and possibly ephemeral nature. Would it be better to stick entirely to the basic factors in stability without explanation of all the political maneuvering involved?